

Customer No.: 31561
Docket No.: 10721-US-PA
Application No.: 10/711,280

REMARKS

Present Status of Application

The Office Action dated March 22, 2006, has provisionally rejected claims 1-8 under 35 U.S.C. §101 as claiming the same invention as that of claims 1-8 of co-pending US Patent Application No. 10/711,470. Drawings were objected for informalities. Claims 1-2 and 5-8 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. §102(e) as being anticipated by Yang (US Publication No. 2004/0092092 A1). Claims 3-4 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Yang in view of Lee (US Publication No. 2002/0104449).

After carefully considering the remarks set forth in this Office Action and the cited references, Applicants respectfully submitted that the presently pending claims are in condition for allowance. Reconsideration and withdrawal of these rejections are respectfully requested.

Discussion of double patenting rejections

Claims 1-8 were provisionally rejected under 35 U.S.C. §101 as claiming the same invention as that of claims 1-8 of co-pending US Patent Application No. 10/711,470.

Applicant respectfully pointed out that the co-pending US Patent Application No. 10/711,470 will be abandoned on May 3, 2006, because Applicant has no intention to

Customer No.: 31561
Docket No.: 10721-US-PA
Application No.: 10/711,280

make response to the Office Action mailed on November 02, 2005 for the co-pending US Patent Application No. 10/711,470. Upon the abandonment of the co-pending US Patent Application No. 10/711,470, reconsideration and withdrawal of these rejections are respectfully requested.

Discussion for the objections of drawings

The drawings were objected for not designating legends --Prio Art- in Figures 1a-1h.

Figures 1a-1h have been amended by inserting legends --Prio Art-. Formal replacement sheets of figures 1a-1h have been submitted in compliance with 37 CFR 1.121(d). Withdrawn of these objections is respectfully requested.

Discussion for 35 USC§102 and 103 rejections

Claims 1-2 and 5-8 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. §102(e) as being anticipated by Yang (US Publication No. 2004/0092092 A1). Claims 3-4 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Yang in view of Lee (US Publication No. 2002/0104449).

The Applicant has carefully considered the remarks set forth in the Office Action.

The Office Action considered that Yang substantially disclose the present

Customer No.: 31561
Docket No.: 10721-US-PA
Application No.: 10/711,280

invention.

Applicants respectfully disagree and traverse the rejections based on at least the following reasons.

Regarding the 102 rejections of independent claim 1:

Applicants submit that the independent claim patently defines over the prior reference Yang for at least the reason that the cited art fails to disclose each and every feature as claimed in the present invention. Particularly, the reference Yang fails to teach or suggest at least the feature “providing a wafer having a plurality of LED chips thereon, wherein each of the LED chips comprises a plurality of electrodes”.

Yang discloses a method for forming a bump 150 to a semiconductor chip 100 (Fig. 1-2E). Moreover, Yang teaches a semiconductor device composed of a device body 200 with a plurality of bond pads 210 on the surface of the device body 200 (as shown in Fig. 3A). The device body 200 “can be a substrate used in a semiconductor package, or a printed circuit board (PCB) for accommodating electronic elements” and is preferably “a semiconductor chip or wafer for a flip-chip structure” (paragraph [0027]).

The Office Action considered Yang’s chip 100 or chip/wafer 200 as comparable to the wafer of this invention, and even asserted electronic elements recited by Yang (paragraph [0027]) as comparable to the LED chips of this invention.

Clearly, according to Yang’s contexts, it is obvious that Yang’s chip 100/200 is

Customer No.: 31561
Docket No.: 10721-US-PA
Application No.: 10/711,280

not equivalent or comparable to "the wafer having a plurality of LED chips thereon" of this invention. Furthermore, as taught by Yang, device body 200 can be a PCB for accommodating electronic elements, which is very different and noway similar to a wafer having LED chips thereon. Actually, nothing is mentioned or taught by Yang regarding the LED chips.

Accordingly, the independent claim 1 clearly distinguishes the present invention over the cited reference Yang.

Dependent claims 2 and 5-8 are submitted to be patentably distinguishable over the cited reference for at least the same reasons as independent claim 1, from which these claims respectively depend, as well as for the additional features that these claims recite.

As for the 103 rejections, the Office Action relied on Lee for teaching the additional features recited in claims 3-4.

However, Lee fails to remedy the deficiencies of Yang. Because all the cited references fail to teach, suggest or disclose each and every feature of the present invention, and therefore they cannot possibly arrive at the claimed invention, as suggested by the Office Action. Applicants respectfully submit that claims 3-4 patently define over the reference Yang or Lee for at least the above reasons, and should be allowed.

In view of the above discussions, reconsideration and withdrawal of these rejections under 35 USC 102(e) and 103(a) are respectfully requested.

Customer No.: 31561
Docket No.: 10721-US-PA
Application No.: 10/711,280

CONCLUSION

In view of the foregoing, it is believed that all pending claims are in proper condition for allowance. If the Examiner believes that a telephone conference would expedite the examination of the above-identified patent application, the Examiner is invited to call the undersigned.

Date :

June 2, 2006

Respectfully submitted,

Belinda Lee

Belinda Lee

Registration No.: 46,863

Jianq Chyun Intellectual Property Office
7th Floor-1, No. 100
Roosevelt Road, Section 2
Taipei, 100
Taiwan
Tel: 011-886-2-2369-2800
Fax: 011-886-2-2369-7233
Email: belinda@jcipgroup.com.tw
Usa@jcipgroup.com.tw